

Honorable Judge Richard A. Jones

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the WESTERN DISTRICT of WASHINGTON at SEATTLE

CASE NO. 2:22-CV-00807-RAJ-BAT

**MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF
EMERGENCY MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF**

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
JUNE 24 (1ST FRIDAY)

*Emergency Relief Required Before
Direct Risk of Incarceration on June
30 2022*

Ashley M. Gjovik (pro se),

Plaintiff(s),

v.

State of Washington, et al.

Defendant(s).

I. MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

1. Gjovik respectfully files this Motion for Reconsideration under Rule 59(3) and Rule 60(b)(6), as well as any other laws empowering the court to reconsider.

2. Gjovik respectfully requests a ruling on her arguments about NLRA preemption and 18 USC 1514 injunctive relief. (Dk 11 & 18). Gjovik argued there was federal jurisdiction prior to state intrusion, but there is no ruling on the arguments.

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

1 3. Gjovik respectfully requests a ruling on the state matter being induced on fraud (the
2 statement made by Petitioner as the “reason” she filed the suit against Gjovik, which the NLRB
3 denies.) This is part of Gjovik’s NLRA preemption argument. (Dk 11 & 18). Today’s order does
4 not mention Gjovik’s arguments or preemption.

5 4. Gjovik respectfully requests a ruling on her argument that she can no longer have a fair
6 state trial, even if she could submit a brief/documents without facing incarceration, because the
7 state of Washington weighed in on the merits of her case in their Response to her Motion,
8 implying serious allegations against Gjovik without evidence or judicial basis. (Dkt #14).

9 5. Gjovik please requests a clarification of fact and law on the order against her. The
10 order to dismiss states Gjovik is only prohibited from posting on social media “*The order also*
11 *prevents Plaintiff from making “any statements or posts” about her former co-worker on social*
12 *media”*, but the order prohibits Gjovik from making statements on any mediums with the
13 exception of “testimony.” The order was based on Gjovik’s federal legal filings where Petitioner
14 unilaterally claimed the federal action and filings were “harassment.” Thus, the order would
15 prohibit Gjovik from filing a state appellant brief. (Dk 11 & 18).

16 **“Respondent shall not make any statements or posts or other publications**
17 **about Petitioner, including but not limited to, petitioner’s medical**
18 **information, petitioner’s family, petitioner’s names, on any social media or**
19 **internet or other medium. Nothing about this Order prohibits Respondent**
20 **from testifying in administrative or judicial proceedings.”**

[REDACTED] v Gjovik, Case No. 22CIV01704KCX, King County District
Court (Mar. 2022). (e.g., Dkt #1, Att #1 at pg 13).

21 Because the order was based on Gjovik’s federal legal filings, Gjovik has a real fear of her
22 appellant filings being used to seek her incarceration.

23 6. Gjovik respectfully requests for an opportunity to respond to state of Washington’s
24 motion to dismiss before the case is closed. Gjovik argued that Subject Matter Jurisdiction did

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

1 not need to be proven for the Emergency Motion under preemption. (Dk 11 & 18). Gjovik has
2 not had the opportunity to present Responsive arguments on the matter.

3 7. Gjovik respectfully requests reconsideration of the statements on Order page 2, line 6-
4 9 as the reason for Gjovik's termination. The reason for Gjovik's termination is actively under
5 review by federal and state agencies. The statement made by the state of Washington, and
6 repeated in this order, are not based on evidence or a hearing, and implicate further Full Faith &
7 Credit issues in Gjovik's open cases.

8 8. Gjovik respectfully requests reconsideration of the factual statements on Order page 2
9 lines 10-21 as they omit the basis of the order, which was Gjovik's federal legal complaint. This
10 is also now the basis of an additional charge of retaliation against Apple for orchestrating the
11 original restraining order petition against Gjovik as Petitioner admitted in her Petitioner &
12 testimony to retaliatory animus for Gjovik's NLRB charge.

14 II. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

15 I hereby certify that on June 28, 2022, I did serve the above Motion for Preliminary
16 Injunction through the Court's ECF filing system pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5(b)(2)(E) to the
17 following counsel for all Defendants: the State of Washington, Governor Inslee, and Attorney
18 General Ferguson (as represented by Asst. Attorney General William McGinty).

19 Respectfully submitted,

20 DATED: June 28, 2022

21 *Ashley Gjovik*

22
23 **ASHLEY M. GJOVIK**
24 Pro Se